

Remarks

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 5, 10 -11 and 16 are currently pending in the subject patent application. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 12 -15 have been cancelled. Claims 5, 10 -11 and 16 have been amended.

II. DRAWING OBJECTIONS

Fig. 1 was objected to because reference number 150 was not mentioned in the specification. In this amendment, that reference number has been added to the specification in the appropriate place. Accordingly, this objection may be withdrawn.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS

§ 112 REJECTION

Claim 16 stands rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The Examiner found lack of antecedent basis for the phrase in original claim 12 for the phrase “said at least one electronic signal.” In amended claim 16 the phrase “said at least one electronic signal” has been changed to “a synchronization pulse from the imaging device”, consistent with the Examiners interpretation. Accordingly, this rejection may be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,674,924 to Fischer, et al. (“Fischer”). Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 12-14 except claim 10 which now depends from the amended claim 11, so these rejections may be withdrawn as moot.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Independent claims 5, 11, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fischer.

Claims 5, 11, and 16 all recite a “video camera providing two vertical synchronization signals for each image frame”, and selecting the “sync pulse” from “one of said vertical synchronization signals.” These synchronization signals recited in the claims are used to coordinate the video image captured with the “triggering signal” generated by the presence of the mail piece. This arrangement is not disclosed by Fischer which instead describes that “the letter transport system and the television camera 20 electronics are not synchronized.” Col. 4, lines 40-41.

Thus the reference does not disclose the combination of the synchronization signals with the triggering signals as recited in the claims. The Examiner’s Official Notice is insufficient because, while synchronization signals may have been generally known, there has been no showing made that the particular combination recited in the amended independent claims is suggested in the prior art.

For these reasons independent claims 5, 11, and 16 and their dependent claim 10 should be found allowable.

III. CONCLUSION

All issues have been addressed. Claims 5, 10 -11 and 16 are in condition for allowance and favorable action is requested. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Cummings/
Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000